



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/556,221	04/17/2006	Yves De Koninck	CU-4511 RJS	3628

26530 7590 02/10/2009
LADAS & PARRY LLP
224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO, IL 60604

EXAMINER

LOCKARD, JON MCCLELLAND

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1647

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/10/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/556,221	DE KONINCK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JON M. LOCKARD	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30,44-53,65 and 81 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30,44-53,65 and 81 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-21 and 53, in so far as they are drawn to a method for treating or preventing pain, comprising modulating the activity of a chloride transporter.

Group II, claim(s) 1-14, 21, and 52, in so far as they are drawn to a method for treating or preventing pain, comprising modulating the expression of a chloride transporter.

Group III, claim(s) 22-30, in so far as they are drawn to a composition comprising a compound of undisclosed constitution which modulates the activity of a chloride transporter.

Group IV, claim(s) 22-30, in so far as they are drawn to a composition comprising a compound of undisclosed constitution which modulates the expression of a chloride transporter.

Group V, claim(s) 44 and 49, drawn to a method for screening compounds which decrease intracellular chloride levels in a CNS-derived cell.

Group VI, claim(s) 45-48, in so far as they are drawn to a method for screening compounds which modulate the activity of a chloride transporter.

Group VII, claim(s) 45-47, in so far as they are drawn to a method for screening compounds which modulate the expression of a chloride transporter.

Group VIII, claim(s) 50-52, drawn to a method for screening compounds which interact with a chloride transporter.

Group IX, claim(s) 65, drawn to a method for diagnosis, comprising determining CNS intracellular chloride levels.

Art Unit: 1647

Group X, claim(s) 81, drawn to a method for treatment of pain in a subject, comprising determining CNS intracellular chloride levels and decreasing an intracellular chloride level in a CNS cell of said subject.

The inventions listed as Groups I-X do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.475(B-D), the ISA/US considers that where multiple products and processes are claimed, the main invention shall consist of the first invention of the category first mentioned in the claims and the first recited invention of each of the other categories related thereto. Accordingly, the main invention (Group I) comprises the first recited method, a method for treating or preventing pain, comprising modulating the *activity* of a chloride transporter. Groups II-X do not share the same or corresponding special technical feature because the Group II invention is drawn to a method a method for treating or preventing pain, comprising modulating the *expression* of a chloride transporter, the Group III invention is drawn to a composition comprising a compound of undisclosed constitution which modulates the activity of a chloride transporter, the Group IV invention is drawn to a composition comprising a compound of undisclosed constitution which modulates the expression of a chloride transporter, the Group V invention is drawn to a method for screening compounds which decrease intracellular chloride levels in a CNS-derived cell, the Group VI invention is drawn to a method for screening compounds which modulate the activity of a chloride transporter, the Group VII invention is drawn to a method for screening compounds which modulate the expression of a chloride transporter, the Group VIII invention is drawn to a method for screening compounds which interact with a chloride transporter, the Group IX invention is drawn to a method for diagnosis, comprising determining CNS intracellular chloride levels, and the Group X invention is drawn to a method for treatment of pain in a subject, comprising determining CNS intracellular chloride levels and decreasing an intracellular chloride level in a CNS cell of said subject. Lack of unity is shown because these methods lack a common utility which is based upon a common technical feature which has been identified as the basis for that common utility.

Election of Species:

2. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. Specifically, the claims are directed to more than one species of compounds which are capable of increasing KCC2 activity. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Art Unit: 1647

(1) inhibitor of TrkB, (2) inhibitor of cyclic AMP-dependent kinase (PKA), and (3) an inhibitor of calmodulin-dependent kinase (CAM kinase).

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

3. The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Species (1): claims 15 and 16,
Species (2): claims 17 and 18, and
Species (3): claims 19 and 20

The following claim(s) are generic: at least claim 14 is generic.

4. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the individual compounds are structurally and functionally different chemical compounds, having different structures and activities. The methods utilizing the different agents also lack the same or corresponding special technical feature for the same reasons. Lack of unity is shown because these compounds lack a common utility which is based upon a common structural feature which has been identified as the basis for that common utility.

Art Unit: 1647

5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

6. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Rejoinder:

8. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

9. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully

Art Unit: 1647

examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1647

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Jon M. Lockard, Ph.D.** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-2717**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Manjunath N. Rao, Ph.D.**, can be reached on **(571) 272-0939**. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197** (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jon M. Lockard, Ph.D.
February 6, 2009

/Jon M Lockard/
Examiner, Art Unit 1647